

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. By the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, and 4-12 are amended to further clarify the subject matter being claimed, and claims 21-31 are added. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found, for example, on page 6, lines 13-16 and lines 23-25, and page 12, lines 11-14 and lines 20-22, of the present specification. Support for newly added claims 21-31 may be found, for example, on page 6, line 25 to page 7, line 1, of the present specification. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments. In view of at least the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Personal Interview

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Topgyal at the personal interview held on May 29, 2009 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saunders et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0288113, hereinafter "Saunders") in view of Westland (U.S. Patent No. 4,685,003, hereinafter "Westland"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office Action acknowledges that Saunders fails to disclose "a preprocessing unit that extracts static image data from the video data by an operator operation that performs setting operations while viewing video data before a disposition and registration of the video data is performed" (*see* page 4 of the Office Action). Therefore, the Office Action cites steps 350, 369, 370, 374, and 376 in Fig. 10 of Westland to allegedly disclose the aforementioned feature of the independent claims (*see* Westland, col. 21, line 55 to col. 22, line 22). In these

steps in Fig. 10 of Westland, the apparatus disclosed in Westland extracts and stores an image (in step 350), the user selects "manual" or "automatic" segment selection (in step 369), the frame that corresponds to the selected segments is digitized (in step 370), the digitized frame (and the associated time codes) is stored (in step 374), and the image is written onto a hard disk (in step 376).

The Office Action explains that, in Saunders, the still images are extracted before the final presentation is created. Furthermore, the Office Action construes the recitation "registration of the video data is performed" to mean *at a time before the moment that the presentation of Saunders is finalized* (see page 3, first paragraph, of the Office Action). Thus, the Office Action concludes that Saunders discloses a preprocessing unit that extracts still images *before* registration of the video (i.e., before the presentation is finalized). Applicants note that the independent claims have been amended to recite "an operator operation that performs setting operations while viewing the video data before a disposition and registration of the video data is initiated." Thus, this amendment corrects the previous misinterpretation of the claims by making it clear that the setting operation is performed before disposition and registration is even initiated, rather than before the completion of disposition and registration (as the Office Action has interpreted the claims).

Applicants submit that Saunders and Westland (either alone or in any combination) fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious the aforementioned feature of the independent claims. Furthermore, during the personal interview held on May 29, 1998, the Examiner agreed that the rejection was overcome, in view of the aforementioned amendments and remarks. Thus, the cited publications would not have rendered obvious claims 1-20. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. New Claims

Applicants further submit that newly added claims 21-31, which depend from independent claims 1, 2, and 4-12, recite allowable subject matter, and respectfully request that the Examiner indicate allowance of newly added claims 21-31.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-31 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Azza M. Jayaprakash
Registration No. 55,299

JAO:AMJ/mkg

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 1, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--